

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This paper is responsive to the Final Office Action (“FOA”) mailed December 8, 2009, and the Advisor Action (“AA”) mailed February 24, 2010. Claims 61-73 and 80-90 were rejected and remain pending. Claims 61-62, 64-71, 73 and 80-81 are currently amended. Claims 74-79 were previously cancelled. All amendments are fully supported by the original disclosure, and no new matter is added. Reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 103

Claims 73, 62-63, 80 and 82 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Keinonen *et al.* (US 6,959,207 B2) in view of Tyroler (US 6,320,941 B1) and Haaramo *et al.* (US 2006/0211411) and further in view of Cannon *et al.* (US 7,103,154).

Claims 61 and 81 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over the same combination of references as applied to claims 73 and 80 and further in view of McLaughlin *et al.* (US 4,975,694).

Claims 64-71 and 83-90 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over the same combination of references as applied to claims 73 and 80 and further in view of Williams *et al.* (US 6,753,842).

Claim 72 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the same combination of references as applied to claim 61 and further in view of Williams *et al.* (US 6,753,842).

Applicants respectfully maintain that the cited combination of references does not teach the recitations of the claims, for at least the reasons discussed in the previous responses filed February 8, 2010 and October 9, 2009. Nonetheless, independent claims 73 and 80 are currently amended (without prejudice) for the purpose of advancing prosecution.

Amended claim 73 recites, in pertinent part, a mobile electronic communications device comprising:

. . . a processor unit . . . configured to

associate the virtual keys with corresponding contacts of a contact list stored on the mobile electronic communications device, each of the virtual keys of said plurality being associated with only one corresponding contact of said contact list, wherein a first contact of said contact list is associated with a first virtual key of the plurality and a second contact of said contact list is associated with a second virtual key of the plurality;

compare received message data to said contact list,

determine, based on the comparison, that a first received message is from a first contact of the contact list and that a second received message is from a second contact of said contact list,

animate the first virtual key to indicate receipt of the first received message from the first contact of the contact list, wherein the animated first virtual key manifests an appearance of being in motion,

animate the second virtual key to indicate receipt of the second received message from the second contact of said contact list, wherein the animated second virtual key manifests an appearance of being in motion,

cause the touch-screen display to display a first list of messages received from only the first contact in response to the selection, by a user, of the first virtual key, and

cause the touch-screen display to display a second list of messages received from only the second contact in response to the selection, by the user, of the second virtual key.

These amendments are supported at least on pg. 2, lines 9-25; pg. 3, lines 4-15; pg. 9, lines 10-19; pg. 12, line 6 to pg. 13, line 8; pg. 15, lines 6-16; pg. 20, line 19 to pg. 21, line 3; and Figs. 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, and 8.

Viewed properly as a whole, as required by law, claim 73 recites a novel mobile electronic communications device configured to display a virtual keypad, associate virtual keys of the virtual keypad with contacts of a contact list stored on the device, animate the virtual keys of the virtual keypad to indicate receipt of a message from the corresponding contact, and display a list of messages received from only that contact upon activation of that key. Claim 73 requires that only one contact is associated with a virtual key of the virtual keypad. In addition, claim 73 requires that animated virtual keys manifest an appearance of being in motion.

Keinonen, Tyroler, Haaramo, and Cannon do not teach or suggest the recitations of amended claim 73.

Keinonen was cited for teaching a transceiver, a touch-screen display, and a processor unit coupled to the transceiver and touch-screen display. The FOA conceded that Keinonen does not disclose that the processor unit is configured to “cause a light unit to light a first virtual key . . . to indicate receipt of a message from a first contact of a contact list stored on the mobile electronic communications device, the first contact being the only contact to be associated with said first virtual key . . .” or the parallel features involving the second virtual key (pg. 3, FOA).

Therefore, by extension, Keinonen does not teach or suggest “a processor unit . . . configured to associate the virtual keys” [of the virtual keypad] “with corresponding contacts of a contact list stored on the mobile electronic communications device, each of the virtual keys of said plurality being associated with *only one corresponding contact* of *said* contact list, wherein a first contact of said contact list is associated with a first virtual key of the plurality and a second contact of said contact list is associated with a second virtual key of the plurality”

Next, Keinonen does not teach or suggest “*animate* the first virtual key to indicate receipt of the first received message from the first contact of the contact list, wherein the animated first virtual key manifests an appearance of being *in motion*” and “*animate* the second virtual key to indicate receipt of the second received message from the second contact of said contact list, wherein the animated second virtual key manifests an appearance of being *in motion*” Keinonen does not disclose animating virtual keys of a keypad.

Finally, Keinonen does not teach or suggest “cause the touch-screen display to display a first *list* of messages received from *only* the first contact *in response to the selection, by a user, of the first virtual key*” and “cause the touch-screen display to display a second *list* of messages received from *only* the second contact *in response to the selection, by the user, of the second virtual key*.”

Tyroler, Haaramo and Cannon cannot remedy the deficiencies of Keinonen with regard to these features.

First, none of these references teaches or suggests associating a plurality of virtual keys of a virtual keypad “with corresponding contacts of a contact list stored on the mobile electronic communications device, each of the virtual keys of said plurality being associated with *only one corresponding contact* of *said* contact list” The LED priority lights of Tyroler are not “virtual keys” of a “virtual keypad.” Moreover, as previously discussed, Tyroler **teaches away** from this recitation by disclosing the use of three separate lists of senders to determine which light should be activated upon receipt of a message (see pg. 10-11, Applicants’ response filed October 9, 2001),

Next, the references do not teach or suggest the animation of a virtual key (of a virtual keypad displayed on a touch-screen display) to indicate receipt of a message from a contact associated with that virtual key “wherein the animated . . . virtual key manifests an appearance of being in motion.” The LED priority lights of Tyroler are not “virtual keys” of a “virtual keypad.” In addition, Tyroler does not teach or suggest the “animate” recitation of claim 73. To the contrary, Tyroler discloses that “. . . the microprocessor activates LED 18A. The LED 18A stays on until the customer acknowledges the same by pushing the clear key 70A” (col. 5, lines 1-5). Cannon merely teaches a messaging system with a voice-to-text converter, and Haaramo merely teaches group messaging – neither of these references teach or suggest the “animate” recitation of claim 73.

The references also do not teach or suggest “cause the touch-screen display to display *a first list of* messages received from *only* the . . . contact *in response to the selection, by a user, of the . . . virtual key*” as recited in claim 73. The FOA conceded that Keinonen and Tyroler do not disclose “causing the touch-screen display to display information associated with one or more messages received from the first contact in response to the selection, by a

user, of the first virtual key” (pg. 5, FOA). As previously discussed, the cited passages of Haaramo refer to **voice** messages (see pg. 12-13, Supplemental Amendment and Response filed October 9, 2009). In addition, Haaramo discloses that the user listens to a message by pressing the respective button, which causes the terminal to play a single message (paragraph [0062]). The next single message is played by pressing the respective button again (paragraph [0063]). Thus, Haaramo does not teach or suggest “cause the touch-screen display to display a first **list** of messages” as recited.

Cannon merely discloses that a digital telephone answering device (TAD) receives voice messages, converts them to text, and outputs the text (e.g. to a storage, printer, display, or other device; col. 5, lines 7-19). The TAD includes a display device 218 that may be used to display information including the contents of the converted text file (col. 5, lines 41-48). However, Cannon does not teach or suggest that the display device displays a “list of messages received from only” one contact. Nor does Cannon teach or suggest that such as list is displayed “in response to the selection, by a user, of the . . . virtual key.”

For the sake of argument, even if the references taught the subject matter for which they were asserted and they were combined as suggested, they still would not teach or suggest the above feature, as previously discussed (see pg. 13-15 of After Final response filed February 8, 2010). In addition, because Haaramo teaches that only one voice message is played at a time, combining Cannon with the cited references as suggested would achieve – at most – the display of **only one text output at a time**, not a “list” of messages received from only one contact.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 73 is allowable over Keinonen in view of Tyroler, Haaramo, and Cannon.

Claim 80 recites features substantially similar to those of claim 73, and is therefore allowable over the cited combination for at least the same reasons.

Claims 61-72 and 81-90 depend from claims 73 and 80, respectively, incorporating the recitations of their base claims. As discussed in Applicants’ previous response, McLaughlin and Williams do not remedy the deficiencies of Keinonen, Tyroler, Haaramo, and Cannon. These claims are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons. In addition, claims 61-72 and 81-90 are further allowable by virtue of their additional recitations, which are not taught or suggested by the cited references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants believe the applicable rejections have been overcome and all claims remaining in the application are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable consideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative at (206) 622-1711 if the Examiner believes that an interview might be useful for any reason.

It is not believed that extensions of time are required beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, if additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present paper, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (206) 407-1542. If any fees are due in connection with filing this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the Deposit Account of Schwabe, Williamson and Wyatt, P.C., No. 50-0393.

Respectfully submitted,
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Date: April 7, 2010 By: /Jo Ann Schmidt/
Jo Ann Schmidt
Reg. No.: 62,255

Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.
U.S. Bank Centre
1420 5th Ave. Suite 3010
Seattle, WA 98101